

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully solicited.

Claims 20 through 24, 29 through 32, and 42 through 52 are pending, with Claims 20, 29, 42, and 44 being independent. Claims 34 through 41 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 20 through 24, 29 through 32, and 42 through 45 have been amended. Claims 46 through 52 have been added.

Claims 32, 42, and 43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as not being drawn to statutory subject matter on the grounds that Claim 32 recites "merely logic" and Claims 42 and 43 recite solely driver software. All rejections are respectfully traversed, and are submitted to have been obviated by the amendment of Claims 20 (from which Claim 32 depends) and 42 to recite a --hardware interface--. Favorable consideration is earnestly solicited.

Claims 20 through 24 and 34 through 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1st paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. All rejections are respectfully traversed, and are submitted to have been obviated by the deletion of the objected-to expressions from the claims. Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that there has been no showing of any evidence or reasons that any undue experimentation would be necessary. See MPEP 2164.04, MPEP 2164.08.

Claims 20 through 24, 29 through 32, and 34 through 45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over the article by Ioannidis, et al., IP-Based Protocols for

Mobile Internetworking (1991) (Ioannidis, et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,371,852 (Attanasio, et al.). All rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 20, 29, 42, and 44 variously recite, inter alia, that the source IP address and the destination IP address are the only IP addresses contained in the packet received from the TCP/IP stack or software, in combination with removing the ethernet header and adding another or a second IP header, with Claim 29 further reciting an application that generates an HTTP request.

However, Applicant respectfully submits that neither Ioannidis, et al. nor Attanasio, et al., even in combination, assuming, arguendo, that the documents could be combined, discloses or suggests at least the above-discussed claimed features as recited, inter alia, in Claims 20, 29, 42, and 44. In this regard, Applicants note that Ioannidis, et al. shows that in the output routine of the IP layer, the IP datagram is encapsulated in an IP datagram of type IPPROTO_IPIP, and that the resulting IP datagram therefore has two IP source addresses and two IP destination addresses, which Applicant submits provides neither a description nor a suggestion of at least the above-discussed claimed features. Meanwhile, Attanasio, et al. discloses, e.g., that a frame header is stripped from the front of the packet, which also provides neither a description or suggestion of at least the above-discussed claimed features. With further regard to Claim 29, the Official Action makes reference to rlogin (port 513) and NFS (port 2049) from Attanasio, et al. which Applicant respectfully submits not to be the application that generates an HTTP request as claimed. It is further respectfully submitted that there has been no showing of any indication of motivation in the cited

documents that would lead one having ordinary skill in the art to arrive at the above-discussed claimed features.

The dependent claims are also submitted to be patentable because they set forth additional aspects of the present invention and are dependent from independent claims discussed above. For example, Claim 24 recites, inter alia, a web browser, which Applicant respectfully submits is neither disclosed nor suggested by Attanasio, et al. The Official Action makes reference to rlogin (port 513) and NFS (port 2049), which Applicant respectfully submits not to be a "web browser" as claimed. Therefore, separate and individual consideration of each dependent claim is respectfully requested.

REQUEST FOR CONFIRMATION OF ENTRY OF SUBSTITUTE SPECIFICATION

Applicant again respectfully requests confirmation that the substitute specification filed October 22, 2003 has been entered. Favorable consideration in this regard is earnestly solicited.

REQUEST FOR INTERVIEW

If any questions remain, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner contact Applicant's representative, Craig L. Plastrik, at (301) 601-7252 to schedule a personal interview. Favorable consideration in this regard is earnestly solicited.

REQUEST FOR ENTRY OF AMENDMENT

This Amendment After Final Rejection is an earnest attempt to advance prosecution and reduce the number of issues, and is believed to clearly place this application in condition for allowance. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that a full appreciation of these amendments will not require undue time or effort given the Examiner's familiarity with this application. Moreover, this Amendment was not earlier presented because Applicant earnestly believed that the prior Amendment placed the subject application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, entry of this Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits that this application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Applicant's attorney, Craig L. Plastrik, may be reached at (301) 601-7252.

All correspondence should continue to be directed to the below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Daniel S. Glueck". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Daniel" being more prominent than the last name "Glueck".

Daniel S. Glueck
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 37,838

HUGHES NETWORK SYSTEMS, LLC
Customer No. 29190

DSG/cmg

DC_MAIN 220104v1